DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 874 CE 026 527

AUTHOR Ganzglass, Evelyn
TITLE The Knowledge Development Plan of the Office of Youth Programs: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development, Occasional Paper No. 63.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 21p.: Paper presented at The National Center for Research in Vocational Education (Columbus, OH 1980).
AVAILABLE FROM National Center Publications, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Rd., Columbus, OH 43210 ($2.20).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Business: Demonstration Programs: *Economically Disadvantaged: *Educational Development: *Educational Research: *Employment Potential: *Employment Programs: Evaluation Methods: Federal Legislation: Federal Programs: Industry: Nontraditional Education: Out of School Youth: Program Evaluation: Secondary Education: Vocational Education: Young Adults: *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: *Office of Youth Programs: Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

ABSTRACT

Using a "Knowledge Development Plan" prepared as a blueprint, the Office of Youth Programs of the Department of Labor has undertaken various demonstration projects and large-scale evaluation and complementary research studies. The Office is experimenting with alternative employment and employability development approaches for economically disadvantaged youth, in and out of school. One of the first objectives of the knowledge development activities was to develop a standard set of assessment measures and thereby establish a uniform data base across a wide variety of program strategies being tested. Baseline data have provided insight into important relationships between school and working. The finding that the skills, competencies, and behaviors that constitute employability are acquired incrementally has led to the notion of benchmarking. If acquisition of employment-related attributes is sequential, then program structure must be sequential. Research is being directed to gaining insights into structuring elements in programs such as Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs. Other focuses are gaining private sector access, testing of alternative work-oriented programs to prevent dropping out and provide incentive for return to school, linkages between CETA and local educational agencies, and institutional change that Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) legislation can bring about. (Questions and answers are appended.) (YLB)

ED190874

Occasional Paper No. 63

THE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF THE OFFICE OF YOUTH PROGRAMS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

by

Evelyn Ganzglass

Office of Youth Programs for Education Affairs
U.S. Department of Labor

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

July 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 026 527

THE NATIONAL CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

* Generating knowledge through research
* Developing educational programs and products
* Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
* Installing educational programs and products
* Operating information systems and services
* Conducting leadership development and training programs

PREFACE

One of the greatest economic and social problems facing us today is the problem of youth employment. How do we make sure our young people have the training and skills necessary to find and keep a full-time job after they finish their schooling? How do we deal with the numbers of young people who drop out of school ill-equipped to enter the world of work?

Several strategies have been developed at the federal level in response to these problems. The Department of Labor has been one of the key governmental agencies responsible for much of the activity in this area, and a great deal of federal money has been entrusted to this department to develop programs to make youth employable and to find them jobs. Here to speak with us on the topic of youth employment and the plans being developed by the Department of Labor to deal with youth issues is Evelyn Ganzglass, special assistant to the administrator of the Office of Youth Programs for Education Affairs.

Ms. Ganzglass holds a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Pennsylvania. She has worked for the Department of Labor in employment and training programs for the past fifteen years at both the national and regional levels. Within the Office of Youth Programs her primary responsibilities relate to improving CETA/education collaborations at all levels—federal, state, and local. In addition, she has responsibilities in a variety of special programs concerned with improving linkages between the worlds of education and work. She also works closely with projects that provide career information to youth.

On behalf of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education and The Ohio State University, I am especially happy to welcome Evelyn Ganzglass and to share with you her speech entitled, "The Knowledge Development Plan of the Office of Youth Programs: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development."

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

THE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF THE OFFICE OF YOUTH PROGRAMS: IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

I had great trepedations in accepting your invitation to address this distinguished group of scholars because I am not personally involved in conducting research on vocational education or even CETA. Essentially, I am a policy analyst with a very programmatic bent. I tend to ask what services make a difference? Why? How can we most effectively deliver these services within the constraints of legislative authority, funding availability, and the ability of institutions to provide the services needed?

I am eager to use research findings if they are understandable, relevant, and timely for my decision-making concerns. As you are all too well aware, much of the research that is produced often is not adequately used because one of these elements is missing. The fault lies both with the policy maker who does not adequately articulate his or her information needs and the researcher who does not devote enough attention to the issue of utilization.

For the past two and a half years, we in the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs have been in the enviable position of having an unprecedented half-billion dollars of discretionary money available for a range of research, demonstration, and evaluation activities designed to develop knowledge on which to base decisions regarding youth policy for the 1980s.

For the Department of Labor, the bottom line is employment--helping youth make the transition from school to work. The fact is that youth from families with the lowest income tend to have the highest school dropout rate and tend to remain unemployed after leaving school. Our overriding concern lies with providing economically disadvantaged youth with the opportunity for work experience and other preparation leading to employment. The key policy question is whether national priority should be given to providing such youth with a subsidized work component as part of their secondary school program. To answer this question, we must rely on research to provide insight into whether such a component increases the school retention rate and postschool employment and earnings success of disadvantaged youth.

Using a "Knowledge Development Plan" prepared in advance of each fiscal year as a blueprint, we have undertaken a structured array of multisite demonstration projects and large-scale evaluation and complementary research studies to experiment with alternative employment and employability development approaches for economically disadvantaged youth who are in and out of school. Although the vast majority of research is not yet complete, we are beginning to get a return on our investment. My intention today is to report to you on our plans, some early findings, and expectations for additional information as well as to suggest implications for further research and follow-through.

Common Measures

One of the first objectives of our knowledge development activities was to develop a standard set of assessment measures and thereby establish a uniform data base across a wide variety of program strategies being tested. This common data base is essential if any generalizations are to be made about program impact across sites and service deliverers. The approach taken by the Office of Youth Programs in measuring program effectiveness and impact has been to focus primarily on behavioral changes in career-related skills and vocational adjustments evidenced by student participants. These have been assessed in two ways: first, in terms of gain scores in job-seeking and job-holding skills, self-esteem, sex bias toward occupations, and other vocational- and work-related attitudes; and secondly, in terms of successes such as motivation to look for and hold a job, on-the-job success, satisfaction after placement, and general social adjustment. Since postprogram follow-up is required at three and eight months, it is too early to report such outcome findings. However, we have verified that, because of matching and random assignment procedures, the experimental and comparison or control groups are comparable on our baseline assessment measures.

The data base thus created will provide an unparalleled source for future study of work-related characteristics of the unemployed youth population and will provide policy makers with an improved understanding of program design options.

Baseline Data

Since the passage of YEDPA, we have gained considerably more insight into the dynamics of youth employment. We have learned that, given an opportunity, youth *do* want to work. We have seen that there is no one youth employment problem but an interrelated set of problems paralleling the development and transition process which occurs for almost everyone from age fourteen to twenty-one. We have observed that the most severe problems are focused on only a relatively small number of minority (usually inner city) youth who seem to be permanently excluded from labor force participation regardless of economic activity. Baseline data collected as part of the Youth Incentive Entitlement Program provides insight into several important relationships between work and schooling:

1. School enrollment and labor force activity are jointly determined.
2. School enrollment and employment are negatively related, suggesting that school and work are substitutes rather than complements.
3. There is a positive relationship between school-year enrollment and summer employment.
4. As educational grade attainment increases, the number of those who are neither employed nor enrolled in school drops steadily.

Additional information will be available from three separate longitudinal data banks: the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, based on U.S. Bureau of the Census data; the National Longitudinal Survey, housed here at The Ohio State University; and the Standard Assessment System, developed specifically for YEDPA programs and referred to earlier.

Benchmarking

These and other recent studies of patterns of youth employment and of the career development process itself have pointed out that the skills, competencies, and behaviors that constitute employability are acquired over a period of time spanning the adolescent and early adult years. Especially for disadvantaged youth, the ultimate goal of employment is reached incrementally. Many disjunctures often prevent attainment of permanent employment that offers opportunities for career advancement. Assuming there is a hierarchy of competencies and intervention strategies that help youth develop these competencies, and assuming we learn to measure these competencies and thereby develop a methodology to determine who is ready to benefit from each type of experience, how can we structure activities to help individuals progress from one step of employability development to the next?

The notion of benchmarking such competency acquisition makes sense in order to use CETA programs as a proving ground for disadvantaged youth, to document their abilities and attainments, and to provide reference points for the prescription and sequencing of services for individuals. Four sets of career development benchmarks have been recommended: (1) benchmarks of basic employability skills or world-of-work awareness; (2) benchmarks of work maturity documenting the ability to arrive ready for work on time and maintain continuity of employment; (3) benchmarks of the educational competencies needed to learn on the job; and (4) benchmarks of vocational competencies.

Considerable work has been done in developing competency standards and measurement devices for educational and vocational skill competencies. The state of the art is much less sophisticated when it comes to defining and measuring employability and work maturity skills. Additional research in this area would have applicability to participant tracking and program measurement within CETA as well as other programs with employability development objectives.

Sequencing

The next research question is a direct follow-up to the previous one and is, in fact, a variation of the standard "what works best, for whom, and under which circumstances" set of questions. If acquisition of employment-related attributes is sequential, then program structure, too, can be thought of in sequential terms.

We observe that those youth who do well in Job Corps are usually the more mature ones who are ready to devote themselves to the rigors of the Job Corps. CETA prime sponsors traditionally reserve on-the-job and specific occupational training for the more job-ready. Vocational education at the post-secondary level is often viewed as being more successful than that at the secondary level. Presumably, some of this differential can be attributed to the readiness of participants to fully benefit from the program.

How can activities be sequenced so that one builds on another, and youth are helped to progress to the best of their abilities? To answer this question, we first need to better understand the dynamics of the various service activities that are the stock and trade of most CETA, vocational, and other career-oriented programs. These include assessment, counseling, skill training, work experience, and vocational exploration, among others. In this context, one could address the question of the comparative effectiveness of activities aimed at developing employability skills versus those concerned with job-entry skills.

Much of our knowledge development activity has been devoted to gaining just such insights into how program elements can be appropriately structured to meet individual client needs. For instance, under the auspices of the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC), an in-depth study is being conducted of how career information services are being delivered within schools and with what impact on improving youth's transition from school to work.

Similar cross-cutting analysis needs to be directed at the various compensatory and career-oriented educational programs in order to develop a framework in which the relationship between programs and program elements can be explored. Like individual activities, these programs presumably can be combined and recombined with others in a sequential and complementary manner. If one is serious about developing long-term comprehensive approaches to employability development, research needs to focus more attention on the interrelationship of programs, on how one program leads into another, and on what kinds of transition mechanisms can be effective in helping people move from one to another.

Such analysis needs to be done regarding financial support programs such as work-study, the Basic Opportunity Grant Program, and CETA as well as program support activities such as the trio programs (Upward Bound, Talent Search, Follow Through), vocational education, career education, CETA, and numerous others.

To carry this point one step further, we need to look at which institutions are most appropriate to deliver different kinds of services at different stages in the youth's development. For instance, what is the appropriate role for school, employers, family, church, and other youth-serving community organizations? Can some of the special services to aid youth in making the transition from school to work be more effectively provided to youth by having community-based organizations work cooperatively with the schools as compared to relying totally on school personnel?

Private Sector Access

Considerable attention within our knowledge development plans has been devoted to gaining greater access to private sector work sites, finding support for youth employment and training programs, and studying the comparative advantage of public versus private sector work experiences for youth. It is too early to draw sound conclusions about the qualitative differences between the two, but indications are that private sector employers are much less likely to tolerate poor performers on the job than are public sector employers. Also, because of the generally smaller number of youth at private sector work sites, the quality of the work experience may be better.

A number of studies have also found that it takes considerably more effort to develop work sites in the private than public sector. There is a trade-off between the number of youth who can be served and the type of experience that can be offered. We are just beginning to assemble data on whether the transition to unsubsidized employment and related earnings is better for youth experiencing subsidized work in the private sector. By next summer we will have information based on a three-month follow-up of participants.

Recognizing the importance of involving the private sector in planning programs, developing competency standards for employment-related skills, and providing opportunities for private sector work experience, continuing attention needs to be directed at research and demonstration efforts aimed at improving program success in this area. Program models might be developed that provide the appropriate incentives and support mechanisms to attract employer participation. Additional models might be developed that address the development of entrepreneurial skills among youth.

Alternative Education

One of the major assumptions being tested under the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP), as well as other demonstration projects, is that alternative work-oriented programs can prevent youth who are in school from dropping out and provide incentives for those who are out of school to return. Most youth served thus far under YIEPP have been potential dropouts still in school and not youth already outside the system who may be brought back through guaranteed employment and other program benefits.

It is too early to tell what the long-term impacts of such a job guarantee may be on school retention patterns. Some impact data will become available during the spring of 1980. Our experience thus far has, however, clearly illustrated that youth will usually not return to traditional school settings once they have decided to leave. We are currently conducting structured experiments testing various alternative education approaches operated directly within the school system as well as outside through community-based and other organizations. Among these is a replication of the Career Intern Program, a fully validated alternative education program model originally developed by the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC) under the contract to the National Institute of Education. We are testing the replicability of the model as well as the consequences of segregating high-risk youth in such alternative programs as opposed to addressing their unique problems in settings with other, "nonproblem" youth.

In order to improve the quality of these services and to assist youth in gaining the necessary credentials for obtaining employment, Congress required the secretary of labor and the secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare "to make suitable arrangements with appropriate state and local education officials whereby academic credit may be awarded, consistent with applicable state law, by educational institutions and agencies for competencies derived from work experience obtained through programs established under youth employment demonstration programs." To date, no thorough analysis has been made regarding the appropriateness of standards developed for granting educational credit for work experience and other career-related courses, nor is anything known about the consistency of criteria developed in states and localities throughout the country.

Although there has been much discussion about the quality of staff in nonschool-based alternative education programs, little data exists on the academic preparation and professional experience of such staff. Similarly, little if any information is available on the level of expertise school personnel have in managing and teaching in alternative programs. Experience from our demonstration projects and the National Institute of Education's work with the Experienced-Based Career Education Program (EBCE) point to the need for considerable staff development and inservice training. EBCE and other projects, including one completed here at Ohio State, have explored and dealt with issues related to the successful operation of such programs. More work is needed. The field is ripe for additional research, demonstration, replication, and testing of viable approaches.

CETA-LEA Relations

Experience with the CETA-LEA linkage provisions under YETP has shown that institutional relationships are generally better in places where communication and particularly viable working relationships existed before. It is assumed that good personal relationships among staff and a familiarity with program operations, procedures, and the like create a better environment in which productive relationships can flourish.

The Council of the Great City Schools pointed out in its report to DOL on CETA-LEA relationships in its twenty-eight-member school districts that while local collaboration efforts between schools and CETA are still rare, urban YETP programs tend, on the whole, to be independently operated.[1] The Council found that "where city and school staff turnover is low, institutional alliances, developed to implement prior federal youth employment initiatives, may form the basis for the new YEDPA programming efforts."[2] They also found that curriculum innovations newly developed under the YETP were likely to be institutionalized if regular school teaching staff were involved.

This is consistent with other observations that activities established under CETA-LEA agreements are generally better accepted within the school system if they are perceived to fit within the legitimate scope of school activities. Legitimacy can be achieved by gaining the approval of school leadership and often by establishing new activities within the framework of accepted educational practice. Thus, a number of exemplary CETA inschool programs are in fact adaptations of validated educational program models such as experienced-based career education or vocational education.

Conserva, Inc., a research firm under contract to the Office of Education, DHEW, and others who have studied CETA-education linkages resulting from the 22 percent set-aside provision under YETP, have commented that in many cases, YETP inschool programs are operated in a project mode outside the traditional institutional framework of either CETA or the schools. Where more than one LEA is involved, schools compete with other potential deliverers of service as well as among themselves for their share of the available resources. Given the uncertainty of annual funding, schools are often reluctant to include CETA programs in their long-term program and administrative plans. Such arrangements, they point out, may be expedient because they permit rapid program implementation in a manner responsive to specific programmatic requirements. They do not, however, bring about real or lasting change in the relationship between schools and CETA.

Institutional Change

Can the short duration YEDPA legislation bring about lasting change? Can activities targeted on a relatively small portion of the total school population be a wedge for change within a total system? We don't know. As part of our planning charter in 1977, we said that the key purpose of the Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act was to develop knowledge and not to bring about institutional change. Yet the new arrangements mandated by law and the vast amount of discretionary resources pumped into the system for knowledge development have, in fact, set in motion significant changes in attitudes and awareness among institutions regarding the problems and potential solutions to youth unemployment and employability development.

We have used discretionary funds to provide financial incentives and rewards for both the CETA and education systems for undertaking joint programs related to counseling and job-seeking skills, private sector involvement, programs that provide for academic credit, and youth involvement in program operations. We have highlighted programs for handicapped and high-risk youth as well as those that specifically link CETA to educational programs. We are testing and documenting the effectiveness of a wide range of intervention strategies and program delivery options.

---

[1] *Youth and Training Programs and the Urban School: Profiles and Commentary* (Council of the Great City Schools, 1979), p. 68.

[2] Ibid., p. 67.

Does this strategy bring about change? What is needed to sustain interest and foster willingness to consider new ways of doing the business of human development? Some would argue that regulatory prescription is needed; others, that incentive funding will inspire those willing and able to change. The strategies undoubtedly must take into account what can be accomplished from the federal level, from the state level, and from the local level to involve the many constituencies associated with this field.

Capacity Building

Whether or not we agree that major change is needed, we can, I believe, agree that both the education and employment training systems need to improve their capacity to carry out their responsibilities. It is important that the lessons learned under YEDPA and elsewhere be incorporated in program planning and operations at the federal, state, and local levels. This requires synthesis, dissemination, and application of what we know. It means that research findings must be translated into usable forms for program and staff improvement as well as for policy and legislative development. There is no greater challenge to the research community.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: The evaluations we have for certain programs (Headstart, for example) show that the data haven't really given much knowledge of what works, for what kinds of people, at what point in the development process. Would you comment on this in terms of your own evaluation studies?

Well, I agree. But in our programs, in addition to the preimposed testing, we are using seven different instruments to measure significant changes. These include a narrative description and inquiries to the participants on such things as what made sense in their program, what the "important parts" were, and careful documentation of the activities. We have a whole range of these. We are also focusing on short duration kinds of activities. These might be one or two hours a week over a period of only a few weeks. On these kinds of short duration activities, we may not find any significant changes, but there is still the desire to get a fix on where the youth are who are going into different kinds of programs. We need more and better feedback on which kinds of youth do better in which kinds of interventions. We are trying to track variations on the same type of intervention strategy to see if we can attribute any differences to such factors as who the program deliverer is or other known variations perhaps in approach or community involvement.

I have asked many of the same kinds of questions about the programs that have been underway for some time. I think there are tremendous variations among programs—in content, in focus, in target populations, in objectives, in the way they are being delivered. I have wondered myself how we are ever going to be able to evaluate them. But yet, for the first time (at least in the newer programs), we will have consistent data among the various programs. Up until now we have not even had that—in any form. You can look at a lot of the evaluation data from the 1960s from all the Office of Education programs, the Department of Labor and HEW programs, and you can't compare any of it because the information is all coming from different directions. We don't even have comparable data sets, so this is an attempt to at least break through that; but how successful our efforts will be, I personally cannot address.

Question: To what degree would definitions or terminology in that approach square with those, say, in the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS)? Would we have comparability of data or definitions between your research and vocational education?

I don't know, but I doubt it. Our instruments (the seven I referred to earlier that were being used originally) were developed basically to capture attitude and knowledge changes and are not necessarily related to anything that would be in VEDS. We're attempting to measure such things as self-esteem, ability of young people to think about themselves in terms of the world of work, and similar factors having to do with attitude or awareness. A large number of these instruments came from the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, and at the moment the whole exercise is being housed there, but other instruments are also being used. All of the regular CETA youth reporting is included in this data set, but the extent to which CETA and VEDS have been made comparable, again, I cannot speak to that. I know there are efforts in that direction, but I don't know what the specific

problems are in relating CETA reporting to VEDS. We *will* have the narrative assessment of the participants, of the teachers, and of the other people involved, plus all the other kinds of evaluations being done. We will have the processed documentation of what is taking place in those programs, so we will have more than we had before, but I am sure we will by no means end up with a perfect system.

Question: What is being done in the way of developing more viable or meaningful follow-up information?

All of the demonstration projects involved in this series (and I think there are eighty some projects) as well as many of the other demonstration projects have follow-up systems built in at three- and eight-month intervals. It is very expensive, as you know. Within the regular CETA system, the follow-up is not very long. I believe it is at thirty-, sixty-, and ninety-day intervals, and some prime sponsors have much more extensive kinds of follow-up arrangements than others depending on the extent of the evaluation efforts. Follow-up is not one of our great strengths, and at least for the research portions, we're doing as much as we can in this area. Then, we have the longitudinal work which will be tracking participants in a whole range of programs over a number of years. I don't know if it has been determined yet how many years it will go, but that, too, will be the longest-term follow-up that we will have had on any of the intervention programs.

Question: Are there any initiatives coming out of the Department of Labor that would lead to a cooperative effort on the part of DOL and vocational education in working with secondary school youth, specifically in the area of employability?

From the Department of Labor perspective, as opposed to the perspective of HEW, one way we are fostering that cooperation is by recognizing that employment and education are inexorably intertwined—you cannot become a fully functioning adult in our society without adequate educational preparation. From that perspective, we in the Department of Labor are fully involved in education. In our programs the objective is to make people not only employable, but to help them obtain employment. We want to take them that next step to employment, not just employability. The emphasis is on placement, on getting people into the labor market—if need be, in a subsidized way, but employment is our main objective. That doesn't mean we disregard postsecondary training but, again, for the purpose ultimately of employment rather than self-enhancement or other goals. We justify everything we do in terms of employment.

Specifically with vocational education, we're doing a whole series of things. Within the last couple of weeks HEW announced fourteen joint projects with DOL selected in response to national competition on vocational education/CETA linkage. A request for proposals went out to the vocational education system asking for proposals in conjunction with CETA. Areas of concern are curriculum, staff development, and anything related to bringing the two systems together. The focus could be administrative or direct program kinds of things. Those obviously have not started, but in the meantime, under the exemplary inschool program, we have all kinds of variations on existing and experimental vocational education activities. Again, we have curriculum sharing tying in with cooperative education programs and joint placement; job development kinds of activities; and utilization of staff, resources, and equipment in many sites. We have a demonstration project run through FIPSE, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, exploring a range of postsecondary activities located mainly in vocational-technical schools but also in certain community colleges involved in postsecondary vocational training. A series of projects was funded last summer to provide a more career-oriented focus to Upward Bound and to provide summer employment related to the vocational focuses of the Upward Bound program. Both work experience during the summer and training related

to that were incorporated into a separate multiyear Upward Bound type of program. Another project, involving a number of predominantly black colleges, focused on CETA/vocational education in summer programs. If we gave money for summer programs to postsecondary institutions, we wanted to see what kind of an enhanced summer component that would bring about. These are only a few of the many efforts in this area.

Question: Do you feel these programs are more appropriate for the postsecondary rather than secondary level?

I am not going to give my opinion on that because I don't have a "yes-or-no" answer to your question. I think each program has to be judged on its own merits. Much of the literature points out that there is a differential between what is taking place at the secondary level versus the postsecondary level. There are those who claim that the most effective skill training takes place at the postsecondary level. I would simply take this as an indication that people are beginning to recognize that there are stages at which youth do better in different kinds of activities and are ready to participate in different kinds of programs. There is tremendous disagreement about that, and my own opinion is that we need much mored research in this area before we can make definite, supportable statements.

Question: You made some interesting comments about the characteristics of success (or lack thereof) in school programs. Can you expand on that? Do you have any more preliminary assessments from the studies you did?

First of all, everything we have is anecdotal—samples, samples, samples—it is all anecdotal from site visits and from going to endless meetings. The Office of Career Education sponsored twenty-two miniconference and ten regional meetings. Basically, what I have learned is that as people started working together, they started trusting each other. They were able to come to some kind of agreement on what the level of program should be and how it should be focused. As that happened, relationships got better and, consequently, programs ran more smoothly.

The Great City Schools report goes into quite a discussion about staffing. For instance, they found that it makes a tremendous difference whether the CETA program is operated through the vocational education people within the school or others—for the most part those "others" probably would be the career education people, but then again, not in all cases. Out of 16,000 LEAs or 460 prime sponsors, we don't know exactly who, in fact, is doing all of this. We are in the process of sending a report to Congress. The man I'm working with from HEW keeps saying, "How many of this?" and "How many of that?" The answer is, nobody knows, but we *do* know that there is a tremendous difference in programs depending upon whether the vocational education people or the career education people are running them. If the program is run by vocational education people, it will be more focused on skill training as opposed to career exploration or career centers. It will probably deal with the higher-level, more advanced student than the other kinds of programs.

There is a tremendous variation in agreement in local school districts on what the role of the CBO should be. In some places, the CBO by choice of the school system and the prime sponsor is basically operating most of the inschool programs. They have had very successful experiences under NYC starting several years ago. In some places, they still call it NYC, although it is something totally different at that point. In other places they all hate each other and they don't want to talk together. And then, depending on the personal relationships involved, different kinds of things develop. This is the flavor of what I have been picking up in my conversations and meetings. CONSERVA has not even come out with its analytical piece yet. All they have at this point is a huge book of models, but

again, one of the things they are saying is that in many cases the coordination has not moved beyond administration. There is really no integration of program. In many cases we find a CETA program stuck somewhere within the school building because enrollment wasn't great enough to warrant placing it in the vocational-technical center. So the program is being operated through the school, yet in many cases the CBO pays the checks because the school's computer system would break down if it had to deal with check-writing. So often those kinds of nonphilosophical issues are really the key to how vocational education and CETA are working together—whether a computer system can handle checks, whether the personalities involved are compatible, whether the physical plant set-up fosters cooperation.

We have found that if the school feels an ownership for and feels it has control over the CETA program, it tends to be more accepted within the school. The academic credit provisions are very much a part of that. If the schools agree to grant credit for their CETA program, then they start worrying about it. It becomes something the principal has to report on and be responsible for; and if the principal is responsible for it, he or she will pay attention to it and give it a decent room. One of the reports said the CETA staff person was hired as coach of the basketball team, and this was a major breakthrough. That's the kind of thing I mean. I have not seen any evidence anywhere to prove that one program model is better than another. So many kinds of "extraneous" things are involved that it is hard to pin success or failure to whether the program meets four hours five times a week or focuses on this variation or that. Those are all the kinds of things that we're testing now, and whether the more successful programs concentrate on more career information or more skill training or more outside-of-school activities, we don't know.

Question: Do you see the CETA program as an *alternative* or a *complement* to the regular public school vocational program? Are we perhaps in danger of creating a new system of segregation by, in effect, channeling the economically disadvantaged into a separate system?

The Department of Labor has recommended and is now going through this whole policy review process which includes an examination of just such issues. The president of the United States will say something in the State of the Union message on what the youth initiative will be. Apparently the only domestic initiative will be youth employment. He will say that the federal government wants to get out of the education business, but in fact, we are in the education business. The Job Corps is the largest alternative education program there is. But we are funding many kinds of programs that school systems now cannot afford. Federally-funded programs provide lower student/teacher ratios, more intensive follow-up, and all kinds of service links to other community agencies that schools just cannot provide. So, in fact, we are creating a capability within the schools that did not exist before.

What we and HEW both have proposed is that more money be put down the education side through ESEA or similar programs to provide more targeted use of those funds. The problem is that our legislation is a special-purpose legislation geared for a special population, and that is what we have to focus on. That does not mean that all youth don't need much more in the way of awareness of the world of work and introduction to that through experiential types of opportunities. Many, many kids want to take part in alternative kinds of programs, but they don't have access to them. That is a real problem, and that's what I'm talking about.

Can a targeted kind of program bring about change in schools? When I was in Baltimore a few weeks ago, I was told that there is a two-year waiting list to get into the CETA-funded alternative education program. So I asked, "Why don't you create more of them?" That seemed to me an obvious solution since they had told me for half an hour that CETA programs weren't really more

expensive when compared to some of the alternatives. When so many kids want to get into a certain kind of program and are dropping out of another kind, it should be telling the school officials something. I think CETA should end up being a work-oriented complement to what takes place in schools. There should be some targeting on special populations, but it should not establish a whole alternative education system. Of course we could end up with three basic tracks—academic, vocational, and third-class CETA. That is a possibility. We need to start integrating all of these and providing a whole range of alternatives. For one specific population, these activities can be funded through CETA, but we are the only ones who have the money and the discretionary authority to try to bring about the necessary changes that we hope will end up benefiting everyone.

We end up fighting a lot of the battles that aren't ours. The whole academic credit issue is not a Department of Labor issue. The law, the regulations, everything we have written has specified that the state law or the prevailing local education policy should be followed. The whole battle over experiential learning and how one grants credit and sets standards is being attributed to the Department of Labor when it is a real problem shared by all education-related agencies. But we're the wedge—we feel that real learning takes place in certain program situations, and we think the kids in these programs should get some kind of credit for taking this training, but we're not dictating what the credit should be. Yet because of the money and all of the activity in this area, all of a sudden educators are paying special attention to what we are doing. Now, that is good because we are bringing about change through these activities. What the implications are for the total system, I don't know; but I think they are important, and I think the schools are going to start addressing these issues. If they don't, they will lose control over them.

Question: So far, you've talked about career development in terms of "job satisfaction"—that is, finding the work itself suitable or rewarding. How do you deal with the typical mentality that views a job solely as a means of maintaining a certain lifestyle?

One of the things we try to teach kids is that if you are a high school dropout who can't read and write you're not going to be able to support a very grand lifestyle. That is a very important lesson, which many kids don't recognize. So we tell them: if you want a decent job, you'd better make some arrangements—get an education, get some training, get into one of the not-so-fulfilling jobs that you can use as your entry into the job world, and get yourself some work experience so that you have some kind of credential to bring to the next employer. We try to impress on them that the values of our society still control the gates to employment, and if you want to have access to employment, you're going to have to behave in certain ways. We don't try to restructure society through this program; we try to help these kids get into the world of work however it is at the moment. Of course, we're working with the employers to get them to provide support and a more open environment, but it's a two-way street. We tell these kids they have *got* to apply themselves, they have *got* to have some kind of training, some kind of education, and they have *got* to show up on the job—on time—and not talk back to the supervisor. They have *got* to do all these things if they expect, within the legitimate system, to have a decent lifestyle.

I spoke to several kids who went through a vocational exploration program a couple of summers ago and they told me things like, "I really wish I had had this experience earlier in high school because I saw that I really don't want to do this kind of work." Another said, "You know, I thought it would be nice to work in the ball bearing factory, but it's really awful. I couldn't do that for the rest of my life. I really should have taken math so that I could get into vocational training courses, but now it's too late." To me, even if kids recognize that their horizons have to be more limited, this represents some progress. Through these experiences they realize that success is not automatic, that if they really want to get somewhere, they have to start making an effort. We tell each one,

"We're willing to support you, to give you some work experience, whether it's subsidized or created, so that you can prove that you can work, that you can move ahead and apply yourself." But that takes quite a bit of maturity, and lots of kids just don't have it. We simply have to work with them until they do.

Question: Can you give us some idea of the extent of community involvement in the various programs? What impact does such community involvement have?

We have no definite findings as yet, but we are working with a whole series of community-based organizations in a project called School-to-Work Transition. We have work-oriented kinds of support programs during lunch hours and breaks. There's also a program after school providing coaching and remedial kinds of help. We are trying to provide various kinds of support. Some of the Hispanic groups are working with Hispanic kids trying to make them feel a part of the school as well as trying to overcome many of the sex-bias problems that Hispanic girls tend to have. They have been brought up to think that they are incapable of doing certain things. One of the real strengths of the community-based organizations is that they can provide the kind of coaching support, general help, remediation, and group counseling kinds of activities that the schools cannot provide. For instance, in Baltimore the program is structured so that Friday afternoon is a rap session where kids out on day jobs can come back and talk about their experiences. A trained counselor helps them to turn these sessions into a positive kind of learning experience. The kids also provide mutual support to each other in a very focused way. These kids experience the same types of problems and encounter the same kinds of biases, so they have a good basis for mutual sharing and support. We're doing a lot of research on that, on exploring different ways of drawing on the strengths of community-based organizations and tying these together into the most effective possible program.

Question: If your basic purpose is to make your clients employable, aren't the percentage figures on those who have reached this goal discouragingly low? What do you see as the major problems?

I really can't tell you. Again, we are lumping together different kinds of things. Until we concentrated on the Youth Programs, we had all kinds of categorical programs. Before 1973 we had MDTA and all the Economic Opportunity Programs. Then we were consolidated into a decategorized program called CETA, and everything was lumped into what was then Title I, which encompassed everything from working with really young kids in career exploration, to high-level skill training, to working with adults. It was all lumped together with no differentiation until intensive efforts with the Youth Program to differentiate it gave us two totally different processes. One is what we're doing with employability development where the immediate goal is not placement as it would be with people who are much more job-ready. There are different measures which must be applied to that kind of program. Success might mean moving a client from A to B when the ultimate goal is D, but for a fifteen-year-old, after four months, the goal is not D—the goal is to return that youngster to school. For that individual you know D will have to come three years later. So we are operating under an entirely different understanding of what the objectives of the program are. It follows, then, that we must develop a different measurement system. We have never been able to measure any of the incremental changes because the only measure we had was placement on the job when, in fact, probably 50 percent of the population we were dealing with were young people for whom that was not an immediately obtainable outcome. So we found we had been measuring the wrong things. Now that doesn't mean we shouldn't be doing better in placement. Obviously we should, but I just can't respond with definite figures at this time.

Question: Of the several units involved in CETA programming (e.g., the school, business/industry, and governmental units), from a practitioner's standpoint, where do you think the major problems occur?

You must remember that the implementation of CETA programs varies from place to place. We have some horrible prime sponsors and school systems where people are not doing much. Then we have just the opposite. I don't think you can make standard judgments across the board. One of the findings that came out is that among the programs that qualify by population, the linkage is often a lot better because it is the same governmental institution that is running both the school system and the CETA program. In a place where the mayor has control over the school board, he or she is able to call all those people together and say, "You *will* work together and you will do it effectively." In these situations, it is bound to work. In palces where the political process keeps these elements apart, where some people are county employees and some report to the school board, it is much more difficult. They have different criteria to relate to for evaluation purposes and it's hard to get agreement. I don't think you can cast blame on anyone. Who does what, differs in different places. In some places, prime sponsors run their own programs, and in some, all they do is manage and fund everyone else. In some places, there is no such thing as a CETA program. CETA merely provides the money that pays for all the other deliverers. And then people ask, is CETA good or bad? Is the CETA program funded through vocational education better or worse than the other programs? It is simply impossible to give a conclusive answer.

LEADERSHIP SERIES
IN VOCATIONAL AND CAREER EDUCATION

Apker, Wesley. ***Policy Issues in Interrelating Vocational Education and CETA***,1979 (OC 56—$1.90).

Baker, Eva L. ***New Directions in Evaluation Research: Implications for Vocational Education***,1979 (OC 55—$1.90).

Barlow, Melvin. ***Implications from the History of Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 15—$1.00).

Bell, Terrel H. ***The Place of Vocational Education in Higher Education: Implications for Education R&D***, 1976 (DL 4—$1.50).

Bell, Terrel H. and Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education: The U.S.O.E. Perspective***, 1974 (OC 4—$1.50).

Bottoms, James E. ***Implications of the New Vocational Education Legislation for Program Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 23—$1.75).

Buzzell, Charles H. ***Productivity: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 19—$1.00).

Clark, David L. ***Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development***, 1974 (OC 5—$1.50).

Clark, David L. ***Research and Development Productivity in Educational Organizations***, 1978 (OC 41—$2.20).

Cohen, Wilbur J. ***Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III***, 1977 (OC 24—$1.90).

Cyphert, Frederick. ***Forces Affecting Program Development in Higher Education: Is Anyone Driving?*** 1975 (OC 11—$1.00).

Day, Sherman. ***Education and Training in the Criminal Justice System: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1979 (OC 52—$1.90).

Delacruz, Joseph B. ***Educational Programs for Native Americans: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 40—$1.90).

Delker, Paul V. ***Adult Education—1980 and Beyond: Implications for Research and Development***, 1979 (OC 59—$1.90).

Ellis, John. ***Vocational Education and Federal Priorities***, 1978 (OC 47—$1.90).

Ellis, Mary L. ***Vocational Education: The Future is Now***, 1978 (OC 37—$1.90).

Evans, Rupert. ***Vocational Education R and D in the Past Decade: Implications for the Future***, 1976 (OC 18—$1.00).

Fallstrom, Charles M. ***The Changing Secondary Education Scene: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 22—$1.75).

Gideonse, Hendrik. ***A Model for Educational Research and Development: 1985***, 1978 (OC 44—$2.20).

Ginzberg, Eli. ***Strategies for Education Reform***, 1972-73 (DL 1—$1.00).

Gleazer, Edmund J. ***View on Community and Junior College Education***, 1975 (OC 9—$1.00).

Glover, Robert W. ***Apprenticeship in the United States: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1980 (OC 66—2.20).

Goldhammer, Keith. ***Extending Career Education Beyond the Schoolhouse Walls***, 1974 (OC 3—$2.00).

Halperin, Samuel. ***Emerging Educational Policy Issues in the Federal City: A Report from Washington***, 1978 (OC 42—$2.20).

Hampson, Keith. ***The Relationship of School and Work: A British Perspective***, 1979 (OC 57—$1.90).

Herr, Edwin L. ***Work Focused Guidance for Youth in Transition: Some Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 43—$2.20).

Hicks, Laurabeth L. ***Programs of Guidance and Counseling Becoming of Age: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 25—$1.75).

Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences***, 1973-74 (DL 2—$1.25).

Jennings, John F. and Radcliffe, Charles W. ***Commentary on Legislation Affecting Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1977 (OC 27—$1.90).

Kolstoe, Oliver P. ***Implications of Research Findings on Vocational and Career Education for the Mentally Handicapped***, 1977 (OC 33—$1.90).

Kottman, Roy M. ***Building a Constituency for Research and Development*** 1975 (OC 10—$1.00).

Krathwohl, David. ***Improving Educational Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 21—$2.20).

Kreitlow, Burton W. ***Trends in Adult Education with Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 13—$1.25).

Kruger, Daniel H. ***Occupational Preparation Programs: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 31—$1.90).

Levitan, Sar A. ***The Unemployment Numbers is the Message***, 1977 (OC 38—$1.90).

McCage, Ronald D. ***The Development of a Comprehensive State Capacity for Program Improvement***, 1978 (OC 34—$1.75).

McCune, Shirley D. ***The Organized Teaching Profession and R&D***, 1977 (OC 29—$1.90).

Marland, Sidney P. ***Career Education: Retrospect and Prospect***, 1974-75 (DL 3—$2.00).

Martin, Edwin. ***New Directions in Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Implications for Research and Devleopment***, 1978 (OC 35—$1.75).

Moody, Tom. ***Vocational Education, CETA, and Youth Unemployment: Meeting the Needs of Inner City Youth,*** 1979 (OC 50—$1.75).

Parnes, Herbert S. ***A Conceptual Framework for Human Resource Policy: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 14—$1.00).

Petty, Reginald. ***Trends and Issues in Vocational Education: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 46—$1.90).

Pucinski, Roman. ***The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education***, 1978 (OC 36—$1.90).

Reider, Corinne H. ***Women, Work and Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 26—$1.90).

Rosen, Howard. ***Recent Manpower Legislation and Programs: Implications for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 7—$1.00).

Scanlon, Robert C. ***Public Schools for the 80's: Implications for Vocational and Career Education R&D***, 1976 (OC 20—$1.50).

Schergens, Becky L. ***The Parent's Role in Career Development: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1980 (OC 60—$1.90).

Schmidt, Hermann. ***Current Problems of Vocational Education in the Federal Republic of Germany***, 1979 (OC 54—$1.90).

Shannon, Thomas A. ***The Role of Local School Boards in the Development and Direction of Programs of Occupational Education***, 1980 (OC 58—$1.90).

Siffin, William. ***Institutional Building in Technical Assistance: The Design Perspective and Some Implications for Research and Development in Vocational Education***, 1975 (OC 8—$1.00).

Simpson, Elizabeth J. ***The Home as a Learning Center for Vocational Development***, 1976 (OC 16—$1.00).

Sticht, Thomas G. ***Literacy and Vocational Competence***, 1978 (OC 39—$2.80).

Tolbert, Jack F. ***The Role of Private Trade and Technical Schools in a Comprehensive Human Development System: Implications for Research and Development***, 1979 (OC 53—$1.90).

Wallace, Bertran F. ***Desegregation and Its Implications for Vocational and Career Education***, 1977 (OC 30—$1.75).

Wills, Joan. ***Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 32—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. and Ford, Gerald R. ***Bringing the World of Work and the Institutions of Education Closer Together***, 1977 (OC 28—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. ***Community Education Work Councils***, 1976 (OC 17—$1.00).

ORDERING INFORMATION

All prices include postage and handling. When ordering use series numbers and titles. Orders of $10.00 or less will be accepted on a cash, check, or money order basis only. Purchase orders will be accepted for orders in excess of $10.00. Please make check or money order payable to: **The National Center for Research in Vocational Education**. Mail remittance and/or purchase order to: National Center Publications, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210. (Prices subject to change.)

The Lecture Series at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education was established to provide a forum for discussing current issues confronting educational research and development among distinguished professionals and National Center and Ohio State University staff. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent official National Center or Ohio State University position or policy.